arXiv:math/0305035v1 [math.GR] 1 May 2003

PRODUCTS OF CHARACTERS AND FINITE p-GROUPS

EDITH ADAN-BANTE

Abstract. Let G be a finite p-group, where p is a prime number, and χ and ψ be faithful complex irreducible characters of G. We study the relation between the number $\eta(\chi,\psi)$ of distinct irreducible constituents of the product $\chi\psi$ and the characters χ and ψ.

1. Introduction

Let G be a finite p-group, where p is a prime number. Let χ and ψ be irreducible faithful complex characters of G. Since any product of characters is a character, $\chi\psi$ is a character of G. Thus it can be written as an integral linear combination of irreducible characters of G. Let $\eta(\chi,\psi)$ be the number of distinct irreducible constituents of the character $\chi\psi$. We study the relation between the number $\eta(\chi,\psi)$ and the characters χ and ψ. Through this work, we use the notation of [4].

Does there exist a p-group G, where $p = 5$, with faithful characters $\chi,\psi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G)$ such that the product $\chi\psi$ can be written as a non-trivial integral linear combination of 2 distinct irreducible characters of G, i.e. $\eta(\chi,\psi) = 2$? The answer is no, such groups with such characters can not exist. Moreover, for any prime $p \geq 5$, the answer remains no. For a fixed prime p, we regard that as a "gap" among the possible values that $\eta(\chi,\psi)$ can take for any finite p-group G and any faithful characters $\chi,\psi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G)$. More can be said in that regard and the main result in this work is the following

Theorem A. *Let G be a finite p-group, where p is a prime number. Let $\chi,\psi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G)$ be faithful characters. Then either $\eta(\chi,\psi) = 1$ or $2\eta(\chi,\psi) > p$.*

In section 6, we show that for every prime $p > 2$ and every integer $m > 0$, there exist a p-group G and a character $\chi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G)$ such that $2\eta(\chi,\chi) - 1 = p$ and $\chi(1) = p^m$.

We wonder if there exist other "gaps". For example: does there exist a 5-group G with faithful characters $\chi,\psi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G)$ such that $\eta(\chi,\psi) = 4$? More specifically we make the

Conjecture. *Let G be a finite p-group, where p is an odd prime number. Let $\chi,\psi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G)$ be faithful characters. If $2\eta(\chi,\psi) - 1 > p$, then $\eta(\chi,\psi) \geq p$.*

If $\chi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G)$, denote by $\overline{\chi}$ its complex conjugate, i.e. $\overline{\chi}(g) = \overline{\chi(g)}$ for all $g \in G$. An application of Theorem A is the following

---

Date: 2002.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 20c.

Key words and phrases. Products of characters and nilpotent groups.

This research was partially supported by grant NSF 9970030.

Theorem B. *Let n be a positive integer. Then there exists a finite set S_n of positive integers such that for any nilpotent group G and any $\chi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G)$ with $\eta(\chi, \overline{\chi}) = n$, we have*

$$\chi(1) \in S_n.$$

In [2] we proved that for every prime p, there exist a supersolvable group G and a character $\chi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G)$ such that $\eta(\chi, \overline{\chi}) = 3$ and $\chi(1) = p$. Thus Theorem B does not hold true assuming the weaker hypothesis that the groups are supersolvable.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Lemma 2.1. *Let p be a prime number and ϵ be a primitive p-th root of unity. Let Ω be a proper subset of $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, p-1\}$ and $\{c_i \mid i \in \Omega\}$ be a set of integer numbers. If*

$$\sum_{i \in \Omega} c_i \epsilon^i = 0$$

then $c_i = 0$ for $i \in \Omega$.

Proof. The minimum polynomial of a primitive p-th root of unity over $\mathbf{Q}(x)$ is

$$p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} x^p.$$

Set $q(x) = \sum_{i \in \Omega} c_i x^i$. Then $p(x)$ divides $q(x)$. If $q(x) \neq 0$, there is some non-zero $r(x) \in \mathbf{Q}(x)$ such that $q(x) = p(x)r(x)$. Since the degree of $q(x)$ is at most the degree $p-1$ of $p(x)$, this can only happen when $r(x) = r$ is a non-zero constant. But then $c_i = r \neq 0$ for all $i = 0, \ldots, p-1$, contradicting the fact that Ω is a proper subset of $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, p-1\}$. We conclude that $q(x) = 0$. Thus $c_i = 0$ for all i. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\chi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G)$, where G is a p-group. Suppose $Z < G$, Y is a normal subgroup of G, that $Z < Y$ and that $|Y : Z| = p$. If $Z \leq \mathbf{Z}(\chi)$ and $Y \not\leq \mathbf{Z}(\chi)$, then χ vanishes on $Y \setminus Z$.*

Proof. See Lemma 2.1 of [3]. □

Notation. We use the notation of [4]. The set of irreducible complex characters of G is denoted by $\operatorname{Irr}(G)$. We denote by $\operatorname{Lin}(G)$ the set of complex linear characters of G.

Let H be a subgroup of G and $\lambda \in \operatorname{Irr}(H)$. Then

$$\operatorname{Irr}(\, G \mid \lambda \,) = \{\chi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G) \mid [\lambda, \chi_H] \neq 0\}.$$

Also, if X and Y are normal subgroups of G, we set

$$\operatorname{Irr}(X \bmod Y) = \{\gamma \in \operatorname{Irr}(X) \mid \operatorname{Ker}(\gamma) \geq Y\}.$$

3. MAIN LEMMA

In [3] we proved that if G is a finite p-group and $\chi, \psi \in \operatorname{Irr}(G)$ are faithful characters such that the product $\chi\psi$ is a multiple of an irreducible character of G, then χ and ψ vanish outside the center $\mathbf{Z}(G)$ of G. The following lemma is a generalization of that result.

Lemma 3.1 (Main Lemma)**.** *Suppose that* p, G, χ, ψ *and* n *satisfy*

(3a) p *is a prime,*

(3b) G *is a finite* p*-group,*

(3c) χ *and* ψ *are irreducible characters of* G*,*

(3d) χ *and* ψ *are faithful, and*

(3e) $2\eta(\chi, \psi) \leq p$*, where* $\eta(\chi, \psi)$ *is the number of distinct irreducible constituents of the product* $\chi\psi$*.*

Then χ *and* ψ *vanish outside the center* $\mathbf{Z}(G)$ *of* G*.*

Proof. Set $n = \eta(\chi, \psi)$. Assume that the lemma is false. Then we may choose p, G, χ, ψ and n satisfying the hypotheses (3a-e), but not the conclusion of the lemma, so that

3.2. *The lemma holds true for any quintuple* p', G', χ', ψ' *and* n' *satisfying the equivalent of* (3a-e) *with* $|G'| < |G|$*.*

We shall prove a series of claims leading to a contradiction which will prove the lemma.

Since χ is a faithful irreducible character of G, we have that $\mathbf{Z}(G)$ is cyclic. Set $\mathbf{Z}(G) = Z$. Observe that $G \neq Z$, otherwise χ and ψ are linear characters and therefore satisfy the conclusion of the lemma. Let Y/Z be a chief factor of G. Because G is a p-group, its chief factor Y/Z is cyclic of order p and it is centralized by G. Since Z is the center of G, it follows that

3.3. $H = C_G(Y)$ *is a normal subgroup of index* p *in* G*, and commutation in* G *induces a well-defined, non-singular bilinear map* $\tau : gH, yZ \mapsto [g, y]$ *of* $G/H \times Y/Z$ *into the subgroup* $\Omega(Z)$ *of order* p *in* Z*.*

Let $\theta_i \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, be the distinct irreducible constituents of $\chi\psi$. Set

$$\chi\psi = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i\theta_i \tag{3.4}$$

where $m_i > 0$ is the multiplicity of θ_i in $\chi\psi$.

Since Z is the center of G, there exist unique linear characters $\lambda, \mu \in \mathrm{Lin}(Z)$ such that

$$\chi_Z = \chi(1)\lambda \text{ and } \psi_Z = \psi(1)\mu. \tag{3.5}$$

Because χ and ψ are faithful, so are λ and μ. Furthermore (3.4) implies that

$$(\theta_i)_Z = \theta_i(1)\lambda\mu \tag{3.6}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. The group Y has a central subgroup Z with a cyclic factor group Y/Z. Hence Y is an abelian normal subgroup of G. Since $\lambda \in \mathrm{Lin}(Z)$ is faithful, it follows from 3.3 that the set $\mathrm{Lin}(Y \mid \lambda)$ of all extensions of λ to linear characters ρ of Y is a single G-conjugacy class of $p = |Y : Z|$ elements. By Clifford theory we have that

$$\chi_Y = \frac{\chi(1)}{p} \sum_{\rho \in \mathrm{Lin}(Y|\lambda)} \rho. \tag{3.7}$$

A similar argument shows that

$$\psi_Y = \frac{\psi(1)}{p} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathrm{Lin}(Y|\mu)} \sigma. \tag{3.8}$$

Claim 3.9. *Assume the notation of* (3.4) *and* (3.5). *Then*

(i) $\lambda\mu \in \mathrm{Lin}(Z)$ *is faithful.*

(ii) $p \geq 3$.

(iii) For all $i = 1, \dots, n$, *we have that* $\mathrm{Ker}(\theta_i) = 1$. *Thus* $\mathbf{Z}(\theta_i) = Z$ *and*

$$(\theta_i)_Y = \frac{\theta_i(1)}{p} \sum_{\tau \in \mathrm{Lin}(Y|\lambda\mu)} \tau. \tag{3.10}$$

Proof. Suppose $\lambda\mu$ is not faithful. Since Z is cyclic, this implies that $\Omega(Z) \leq \mathrm{Ker}(\lambda\mu)$, where $\Omega(Z)$ is the cyclic subgroup of Z of order p. By (3.6) we have that $\Omega(Z) \leq \mathrm{Ker}(\theta_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We know from 3.3 that $[G, Y] \leq \Omega(Z) \leq \mathrm{Ker}(\theta_i)$. Therefore $Y \leq Z(\theta_i)$, and for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have $(\theta_i)_Y = \theta_i(1)\delta_i$ for some $\delta_i \in \mathrm{Lin}(Y)$. Now (3.4), (3.7) and (3.8) imply that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i \theta_i(1)\delta_i = \chi_Y \psi_Y = \frac{\chi(1)\psi(1)}{p^2} \sum_{\rho \in \mathrm{Lin}(Y|\lambda), \sigma \in \mathrm{Lin}(Y|\mu).} \rho\sigma.$$

This is impossible because the leftmost expression has at most n distinct irreducible constituents, where $2n \leq p$ by assumption, and the rightmost expression has precisely p distinct irreducible constituents. This contradiction proves that $\lambda\mu$ is a faithful character.

If $p = 2$, then both λ and μ restrict to the single faithful linear character ϵ of the group $\Omega(Z)$ of order 2. Then $(\lambda\mu)_{\Omega(Z)} = \epsilon^2 = 1$ and $\lambda\mu$ is not faithful. This contradiction with the first statement of the claim proves the second statement.

By (3.4), for $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have that θ_i lies above $\lambda\mu$. Assume that $\mathrm{Ker}(\theta_j) \neq 1$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Observe that $\mathrm{Ker}(\theta_j)$ is a normal subgroup of G. Since G is a nilpotent subgroup and $\mathrm{Ker}(\theta_j) \neq 1$, we have that $Z \cap \mathrm{Ker}(\theta_j) \neq 1$. Observe that $Z \cap \mathrm{Ker}(\theta_j) \leq \mathrm{Ker}(\lambda\mu)$ since θ_j lies above $\lambda\mu$ by (3.6). By (i) we have that $\mathrm{Ker}(\lambda\mu) = 1$. Thus for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have that $\mathrm{Ker}(\theta_i) = 1$.

An argument similar to that given for (3.7), shows that (3.10) holds.

□

Claim 3.11. *Let* $\rho \in \mathrm{Irr}(Y \mid \lambda)$ *and* $\sigma \in \mathrm{Irr}(Y \mid \mu)$ *be characters of* Y. *Set* $G_{\rho\sigma} = \{g \in G \mid (\rho\sigma)^g = \rho\sigma\}$. *Then*

(i) θ_i *lies above* $\rho\sigma$ *for all* $i = 1, \dots, n$.

(ii) $G_{\rho\sigma} = H$.

(iii) For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, *there exists a unique character* $(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma} \in \mathrm{Irr}(H \mid \rho\sigma)$ *inducing* θ_i. *Also*

$$((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})_Y = (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\rho\sigma. \tag{3.12}$$

(iv) There exist unique characters $\chi_\rho \in \mathrm{Irr}(H \mid \rho)$ *and* $\psi_\sigma \in \mathrm{Irr}(H \mid \sigma)$ *inducing* χ *and* ψ, *respectively.*

Proof. Since $\rho\sigma \in \mathrm{Irr}(Y \mid \lambda\mu)$, (i) follows from (3.10).

(ii) Since $H = \mathbf{C}_G(Y)$, clearly $H \leq G_{\rho\sigma}$. Since $Z = Z(\theta_i)$ by Claim 3.9 (iii), we have $G_{\rho\sigma} < G$. It follows that $H = G_{\rho\sigma}$, since $|G : H| = p$ and G is a p-group.

(iii) Since θ_i lies above $\rho\sigma$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, while $H = G_{\rho\sigma}$, by Clifford Theory we have that there exists a unique character $(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma} \in \operatorname{Irr}(H \mid \rho\sigma)$ inducing θ_i. Since $H = G_{\rho\sigma}$ and $(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma} \in \operatorname{Irr}(H \mid \rho\sigma)$, we have that (3.12) holds

(iv) By 3.3 we have that $H = \mathbf{C}_G(Y)$ is the stabilizer $H = G_\rho = G_\sigma$ of both ρ and σ in G. Thus, Clifford Theory, (3.7) and (3.8) give us unique characters $\chi_\rho \in \operatorname{Irr}(H \mid \rho)$ and $\psi_\sigma \in \operatorname{Irr}(H \mid \sigma)$ inducing χ and ψ, respectively.

□

Claim 3.13. *Let $\rho \in \operatorname{Irr}(Y \mid \lambda)$ and $\sigma \in \operatorname{Irr}(Y \mid \mu)$ be characters of Y. Assume the notation of (3.4) and Claim 3.11. Then there exist a subset S of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, and integers l_i such that*

$$\chi_\rho\psi_\sigma = \sum_{i \in S} l_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma},$$

and $0 < l_i \leq m_i$ for all $i \in S$.

Proof. By Clifford Theory the restrictions of χ_ρ and ψ_σ to Y satisfy $(\chi_\rho)_Y = \chi_\rho(1)\rho$ and $(\psi_\sigma)_Y = \psi_\sigma(1)\sigma$. Hence

$$(\chi_\rho\psi_\sigma)_Y = (\chi_\rho)_Y(\psi_\sigma)_Y = \chi_\rho(1)\psi_\sigma(1)\rho\sigma.$$

So there are unique non-negative integers m_φ such that

$$\chi_\rho\psi_\sigma = \sum_{\varphi \in \operatorname{Irr}(H \mid \rho\sigma)} m_\varphi \varphi.$$

Because H is $G_{\rho\sigma}$, Clifford theory tells us that the φ^G, for $\varphi \in \operatorname{Irr}(H \mid \rho\sigma)$, are the distinct members of $\operatorname{Irr}(G \mid \rho\sigma)$. Hence

$$(\chi_\rho\psi_\sigma)^G = \sum_{\varphi \in \operatorname{Irr}(H|\rho\sigma)} m_\varphi \varphi^G$$

is the unique decomposition of $(\chi_\rho\psi_\sigma)^G$ as an integral linear combination of irreducible characters φ^G of G.

The product character $\chi\psi = (\chi_\rho)^G(\psi_\sigma)^G$ is the sum of $(\chi_\rho\psi_\sigma)^G$ and some other characters. Since $\chi\psi = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i\theta_i$ by (3.4), it follows that

$$\sum_{\varphi \in \operatorname{Irr}(H|\rho\sigma)} m_\varphi \varphi^G = \sum_{i=1}^n l_i\theta_i$$

for some integers l_i such that $0 \leq l_i \leq m_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Set $S = \{i \mid l_i > 0\}$. Hence $m_\varphi = 0$ for all $\varphi \in \operatorname{Irr}(H \mid \rho\sigma)$ except for those in $\{(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma} \mid i \in S\}$, and $m_\varphi = l_i$ if $\varphi = (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}$. Thus

$$\chi_\rho\psi_\sigma = \sum_{i \in S} l_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}.$$

□

If $Y = H$ then $|G : Z| = |G : H||H : Z| = p^2$, and $\chi(1) = \psi(1) = p$. Thus χ and ψ vanish outside Z by Corollary 2.30 of [4]. Since p, G, χ, ψ and n do not satisfy the conclusion of the theorem, we have that $Y < H$.

If the abelian group Y is not cyclic, then it is the direct product $Y = Z \times K$ of its cyclic subgroup Z of index p with some subgroup K of order p. Evidently $\rho = \lambda \times 1_K$ is one of the characters ρ in $\operatorname{Lin}(Y \mid \lambda)$ and has K as its kernel.

Similarly $\sigma = \mu \times 1_K \in \operatorname{Lin}(\, Y \mid \mu\,)$ has K in its kernel. Thus we may choose ρ and σ such that

$$\rho \in \operatorname{Lin}(Y \mid \lambda),\ \ \sigma \in \operatorname{Lin}(Y \mid \mu) \text{ and } \operatorname{Ker}(\rho) = \operatorname{Ker}(\sigma) = K. \tag{3.14}$$

If Y is cyclic, then any characters $\rho \in \operatorname{Lin}(\, Y \mid \lambda\,)$, $\sigma \in \operatorname{Lin}(\, Y \mid \mu\,)$ are faithful since λ and μ are faithful. So in this case we may also choose ρ and σ so that (3.14) holds with $K = 1$.

In both cases 3.3 implies that $H = \mathbf{C}_G(Y)$ is the stabilizer $H = G_\rho = G_\sigma$ of both ρ and σ in G. Hence $K = \operatorname{Ker}(\rho) = \operatorname{Ker}(\sigma)$ is a normal subgroup of H.

Now we pass to the factor group $\overline{H} = H/K$ and its normal subgroup $\overline{Y} = Y/K$. In view of (3.14), the H-invariant characters ρ and σ of Y are inflated from unique faithful characters $\overline{\rho}$ and $\overline{\sigma}$, respectively, in $\operatorname{Lin}(\overline{Y})$. So $\overline{Y}$ is a cyclic central subgroup of $\overline{H}$. Since $(\chi_\rho)_Y = \chi_\rho(1)\rho$ and $(\psi_\sigma)_Y = \psi_\sigma(1)\sigma$, we have that χ_ρ and ψ_σ are inflated from unique characters $\overline{\chi} \in \operatorname{Irr}(\,\overline{H} \mid \overline{\rho}\,)$ and $\overline{\psi} \in \operatorname{Irr}(\,\overline{H} \mid \overline{\sigma}\,)$. Also $(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}$ inflates from $\overline{\theta_i} \in \operatorname{Irr}(\,\overline{H} \mid \overline{\rho\sigma}\,)$, for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. By Claim 3.13 we have that

3.15. *the number l of distinct irreducible constituents of $\overline{\chi}\overline{\psi}$ is at most n.*

Let $V/K = \mathbf{Z}(H/K)$. Note that $Y \neq G$ and that $Y \leq \mathbf{Z}(H) \leq V$.

Claim 3.16. $V > Y$.

Proof. Suppose that $\overline{Y} = \mathbf{Z}(\overline{H}) = V/K$. Since ρ and σ are faithful linear characters of $\overline{Y}$, and G is a p-group, the characters $\overline{\chi} \in \operatorname{Irr}(\,\overline{H} \mid \overline{\rho}\,)$ and $\overline{\psi} \in \operatorname{Irr}(\,\overline{H} \mid \overline{\sigma}\,)$ are faithful. So all the conditions (3a-e) are satisfied by p, $\overline{H}$, $\overline{\chi}$, $\overline{\psi}$ and l. Since $|\overline{H}| \leq |H| < |G|$, by the inductive hypothesis 3.2 we have that each of the characters $\overline{\chi}$ and $\overline{\psi}$ vanishes on $\overline{H} \setminus \overline{Y}$. It follows that χ_ρ and ψ_σ vanish on $H \setminus Y$. Hence $\chi = (\chi_\rho)^G$ and $\psi = (\psi_\sigma)^G$ vanish on $G \setminus Y$. But (3.7) and (3.8) imply that χ and ψ vanish on $Y \setminus Z$. This contradicts our assumption that the conclusion of the lemma does not hold for p, G, χ, ψ and n. Thus $\overline{Y} \neq \mathbf{Z}(\overline{H})$ and the claim is proved. ☐

Claim 3.17. *Let U be a normal subgroup of H such that $Y < U$ and $|U : Y| = p$. Assume that $U \leq \mathbf{Z}((\theta_j)_{\rho\sigma})$ for some $j = 1, \dots, n$. Then for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have that $U \leq \mathbf{Z}((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})$. Thus for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, there is some $\nu_i \in \operatorname{Lin}(\, U \mid \rho\sigma\,)$ such that*

$$((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})_U = (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\nu_i.$$

Proof. Observe that $((\theta_j)_{\rho\sigma})_U = (\theta_j)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\nu_i$, for some H-invariant $\nu_j \in \operatorname{Lin}(\, U \mid \rho\sigma\,)$, since $U \leq \mathbf{Z}((\theta_j)_{\rho\sigma})$. Suppose that for some i we have that $U \not\leq \mathbf{Z}((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})$. Since $Y \leq \mathbf{Z}(H)$, $|U : Y| = p$ and $U \trianglelefteq H$, we have that

$$((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})_U = \frac{(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)}{p} \sum_{\nu \in \operatorname{Lin}(\, U \mid \rho\sigma\,)} \nu.$$

Thus the set $\operatorname{Lin}(\, U \mid \rho\sigma\,)$ forms a single H-conjugacy class. In particular there is no H-invariant $\nu \in \operatorname{Lin}(\, U \mid \rho\sigma\,)$. This is a contradiction since ν_j is H-invariant. Thus the claim holds. ☐

Claim 3.18. $\mathbf{Z}(H) > Y$.

Proof. Certainly Y is a subgroup of the center of $H = C_G(Y)$. We suppose that equality occurs. Since $V > Y$, we can choose a normal subgroup U of H such that $Y < U \leq V$ and $|U : Y| = p$. We have $1 < [H, U] \leq [H, V] \leq K$, and thus

$[H,U]=K$. In particular, we see that $U \le \mathbf{Z}(\chi_\rho)$ and $U \le \mathbf{Z}(\psi_\sigma)$. Thus there are unique linear characters α and β in $\mathrm{Lin}(U)$ such that

$$(\chi_\rho)_U = \chi_\rho(1)\alpha \text{ and } (\psi_\sigma)_U = \psi_\sigma(1)\beta, \tag{3.19}$$

and so all values of χ_ρ and ψ_σ on U are nonzero.

For any $g \in G \setminus H$ we have that $(\chi_\rho)^g$ is an irreducible constituent of χ_H. We certainly have $K > 1$, since $1 < [H,U] \le K$. So $|K| = p$ and $K \cap K^g = 1$. Note that $U \not\le \mathbf{Z}((\chi_\rho)^g)$ since if $U \le \mathbf{Z}((\chi_\rho)^g)$ then $[H,U] \le \mathrm{Ker}((\chi_\rho)^g) = K^g$, which gives the contradiction $1 < [H,U] \le K \cap K^g = 1$. Since $Y \le \mathbf{Z}(H)$ and $|U:Y| = p$, Lemma 2.2 implies that $(\chi_\rho)^g$ vanishes on $U \setminus Y$. Fix $u \in U \setminus Y$. Since $(\chi_\rho)^G = \chi$ and $|G:H| = p$, we have that

$$\chi(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} (\chi_\rho)^{g^i}(u) = \chi_\rho(u) \neq 0.$$

Similarly

$$\psi(u) = \psi_\sigma(u) \neq 0 \ \text{ and } \ \theta_i(u) = (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(u) \neq 0 \text{ for all } i.$$

By (3.19) and Claim 3.13, we have that

$$((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})_U = (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\gamma, \tag{3.20}$$

where $\gamma = \alpha\beta \in \mathrm{Lin}(U)$, for all $i \in S$.

By (3.4) we have

$$\chi_\rho(1)\alpha(u)\psi_\sigma(1)\beta(u) = \chi_\rho(u)\psi_\sigma(u) = \chi(u)\psi(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i\theta_i(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(u). \tag{3.21}$$

By Claim 3.13 we have:

$$\chi_\rho(1)\psi_\sigma(1)\alpha(u)\beta(u) = \chi_\rho(u)\psi_\sigma(u) = \sum_{i\in S} l_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(u) = [\sum_{i\in S} l_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)]\gamma(u). \tag{3.22}$$

By (3.20) and Claim 3.17, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ we have that $((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})_U = (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\nu_i$, for some $\nu_i \in \mathrm{Irr}(\,U \mid \rho\sigma\,)$. Since $(\nu_i)_Y = \rho\sigma = \gamma_Y \in \mathrm{Irr}(Y)$ and $|U:Y| = p$, there exists some $\delta_i \in \mathrm{Irr}(U \bmod Y)$ such that $\nu_i = \delta_i\gamma$. Thus for $i = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})_U = (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\delta_i\gamma, \tag{3.23}$$

for some $\delta_i \in \mathrm{Irr}(Y \bmod U)$. Combining this with (3.21) and (3.22) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\delta_i(u)\gamma(u) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(u)\\ &= \chi_\rho(1)\psi_\sigma(1)\alpha(u)\beta(u)\\ &= [\sum_{i\in S} l_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)]\gamma(u).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\gamma(u) \neq 0$, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\delta_i(u) = \sum_{i\in S} l_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1).$$

Thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\delta_i(u) - \sum_{i\in S} l_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1) = 0. \tag{3.24}$$

Since $\delta_i \in \operatorname{Irr}(U \bmod Y)$ and U/Y is cyclic of order p, it follows that $\delta_i(u)$ is a p-th root of unit for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Let ϵ be a primitive p-th root of unit. Set $\Omega_i = \{j \mid \delta_j(u) = \epsilon^i\}$ and $\Omega = \{i \mid |\Omega_i| \neq 0\}$. Let

$$c_i = \begin{cases} \sum_{j\in\Omega_0} m_j(\theta_j)_{\rho\sigma}(1) - \sum_{i\in S} l_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1) & \text{if } i = 0 \\ \sum_{j\in\Omega_i} m_j(\theta_j)_{\rho\sigma}(1) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that the set $\{\, c_i \mid i \in \Omega \,\}$ is a set of integer numbers. Observe that $n < p$ implies that $|\{\delta_j(u) \mid j = 1, \ldots, n\}| = |\Omega| < p$. So Ω is a proper subset of $\{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$. Thus by Claim 2.1 we have that $c_i = 0$ for $i \in \Omega$. Suppose that Ω_i is non-empty for some $i \neq 0$. Since m_j and $\theta_j(1)$ are nonzero positive integers, for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$, we have that $\sum_{j\in\Omega_i} m_j(\theta_j)_{\rho\sigma}(1) \geq |\Omega_i| > 0$. But $c_i = 0$. Hence Ω_i is empty for all $i \neq 0$. In particular $\Omega_0 = \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$. Also, since $c_0 = 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1) = \sum_{i\in S} l_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_\rho(1)\psi_\sigma(1) &= \sum_{i\in S} l_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{p}\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i(\theta_i)(1) = \frac{1}{p}\chi(1)\psi(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{p}(p\chi_\rho(1))(p\psi_\sigma(1)) = p\chi_\rho(1)\psi_\sigma(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $p = 1$, which is obviously impossible. □

3.25. *Fix a normal subgroup X of G such that X/Y is a chief factor of G and $X \leq \mathbf{Z}(H)$. Let α, β, $\gamma \in \operatorname{Lin}(X)$, where $\gamma = \alpha\beta$, be the unique linear characters such that*

$$(\chi_\rho)_X = \chi_\rho(1)\alpha, (\psi_\sigma)_X = \psi_\sigma(1)\beta, \text{ and } ((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})_X = (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\gamma \text{ for } i \in S.$$

Also, for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, there is some $\nu_i \in \operatorname{Lin}(\, X \mid \rho\sigma \,)$ such that

$$((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})_X = (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\nu_i.$$

Claim 3.26. *The subgroup $[X, G]$ generates $Y = [X, G]Z$ modulo Z.*

Proof. Since Y, X are normal subgroups of G with $Y \lhd X$ and $|X/Y| = p$, the chief factors X/Y of the p-group G is centralized by G. So $[X, G] \leq Y$. Suppose that $[X, G]Z < Y$. Since $|Y/Z| = p$, we must have $[X, G] \leq Z = \mathbf{Z}(G)$. So commutation in G induces a bilinear map

$$d : xZ, g\mathbf{C}_G(X) \mapsto [x, g]$$

of $(X/Z) \times (G/\mathbf{C}_G(X))$ into the cyclic group Z. This map d is non-singular on the right by the definition of $\mathbf{C}_G(X)$. It is non-singular on the left since $Z = \mathbf{Z}(G)$. Because $\alpha \in \operatorname{Lin}(X \mid \rho)$ extends the faithful character $\lambda \in \operatorname{Irr}(Z)$, and $|X : Z| = p^2$, this implies that $\mathbf{C}_G(X) = G_\alpha$ has index p^2 in G. But H fixes α by 3.25, since

$\chi_\rho \in \mathrm{Irr}(H)$. Therefore α has, at the same time, p^2 distinct G conjugates, and at most $p = |G : H|$ such conjugates. This contradiction proves the claim. □

3.27. *Observe that G/H is cyclic of order p. So we may choose $g \in G$ such that the distinct cosets of H in G are H, Hg, Hg^2, …, Hg^{p-1}.*

Since $\chi = (\chi_\rho)^G$ is induced from $\chi_\rho \in \mathrm{Irr}(H)$, it follows from 3.25 that

$$\chi_X = \chi_\rho(1)(\alpha + \alpha^g + \ldots + \alpha^{g^{p-1}}) = \chi_\rho(1)\sum_{i=0}^{p-1}\alpha^{g^i}.$$

Similarly, we have that

$$\psi_X = \psi_\sigma(1)(\beta + \beta^g + \ldots + \beta^{g^{p-1}}) = \psi_\sigma(1)\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\beta^{g^j}.$$

Combining the two previous equations we have that

$$\chi_X\psi_X = (\chi_\rho(1)\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\alpha^{g^j})(\psi_\sigma(1)\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\beta^{g^j}) = \chi_\rho(1)\psi_\sigma(1)\sum_{i=0}^{p-1}\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}\alpha^{g^i}\beta^{g^j}. \tag{3.28}$$

By (3.4) we have that

$$(\chi\psi)_X = (\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i\theta_i)_X = \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i[(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\delta_i\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}(\alpha\beta)^{g^j}]. \tag{3.29}$$

Claim 3.30. *Let $g \in G$ be as in 3.27. For each $i = 0, 1, \ldots, p-1$, there exist $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$ and $\delta_{g^i} \in \mathrm{Irr}(X \bmod Y)$ such that*

$$\alpha\beta^{g^i} = (\alpha\beta)^{g^j}\delta_{g^i}. \tag{3.31}$$

Also $|\{\delta_{g^i} \mid i = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, p-1\}| \leq n$.

Proof. Since H is a normal subgroup of G and $\theta_i = ((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})^G$, where $(\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma} \in \mathrm{Irr}(H \mid \rho\sigma)$, we have

$$(\theta_i)_H = \sum_{j=0}^{p-1}((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})^{g^j}. \tag{3.32}$$

Since X/Y is cyclic, by 3.25 it follows that there exists some $\delta_i \in \mathrm{Irr}(X \bmod Y)$ such that $\nu_i = \alpha\beta\delta_i$. Since X/Y is a chief factor of G, we have that G acts trivially on X/Y. Thus

$$(\nu_i)^{g^j} = (\alpha\beta)^{g^j}\delta_i \tag{3.33}$$

for all $j = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
(\theta_i)_X = ((\theta_i)_H)_X &= (\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})^{g^j})_X && \text{by (3.32)}\\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{p-1}(((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})^{g^j})_X = \sum_{j=0}^{p-1}(((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma})_X)^{g^j} && \text{since } X \trianglelefteq G\\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{p-1}((\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\nu_i)^{g^j} = (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}(\nu_i)^{g^j}\\
&= (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}(\alpha\beta\delta_i)^{g^j} = (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}(\alpha\beta)^{g^j}\delta_i && \text{by (3.33)}\\
&= (\theta_i)_{\rho\sigma}(1)\delta_i\sum_{j=0}^{p-1}(\alpha\beta)^{g^j}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since X is an abelian group, its irreducible characters are linear, and any product of linear characters is irreducible. Observe that $\chi_X\psi_X = (\chi\psi)_X$. Thus, given $i = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$, by (3.28) and (3.29) there exist some j and some k such that

$$\alpha\beta^{g^i} = (\alpha\beta)^{g^j}\delta_k.$$

Thus (3.31) holds with $\delta_{g^i} = \delta_k \in \operatorname{Irr}(X \bmod Y)$. Also, the set $\{\delta_{g^i} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ is a subset of $\{\delta_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Therefore the last statement of Claim 3.30 holds. □

Claim 3.34. *Let $g \in G$ be as in 3.27. Then there exist three distinct integers $i, j, k \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$, and some $\delta \in \operatorname{Irr}(X \bmod Y)$, such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha\beta^{g^i} &= (\alpha\beta)^{g^r}\delta,\\
\alpha\beta^{g^j} &= (\alpha\beta)^{g^s}\delta,\\
\alpha\beta^{g^k} &= (\alpha\beta)^{g^t}\delta,
\end{aligned}$$

for some $r, s, t \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$.

Proof. By Claim 3.30, for each $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1$ there exists $\delta_{g^i} \in \operatorname{Irr}(X \bmod Y)$ such that

$$\alpha\beta^{g^i} = (\alpha\beta)^{g^r}\delta_{g^i},$$

for some $r \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$. Since $\{\delta_{g^i} \mid i = 0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ has at most n elements and $n \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$, there must exist three distinct i,j,$k \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ such that $\delta_{g^i} = \delta_{g^j} = \delta_{g^k}$. □

Claim 3.35. *We can choose the element g in 3.27 such that one of the following holds:*

(i) There exists some $j = 2, \dots, p-1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha\beta^{g} &= (\alpha\beta)^{g^r},\\
\alpha\beta^{g^j} &= (\alpha\beta)^{g^s},
\end{aligned}$$

for some $r, s \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ with $r \neq 1$.

(ii) There exist j and k such that $1 < j < k < p$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha\beta^{g} &= (\alpha\beta)^{g^r}\delta, \\ \alpha\beta^{g^j} &= (\alpha\beta)^{g^s}\delta, \\ \alpha\beta^{g^k} &= (\alpha\beta)^{g^t}\delta, \end{aligned}$$

for some $\delta \in \mathrm{Irr}(X \bmod Y)$ and some $r, s, t \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$ with $r \neq 1$.

Proof. Since $\alpha_Y = \rho \in \mathrm{Lin}(Y)$ and $\rho^f \neq \rho$ for any $f \in G \setminus H$, we have that $(\alpha\beta^f)_Y \neq (\alpha^f\beta^f)_Y$. So if $\alpha\beta^f = (\alpha\beta)^{f^r}\delta$ for some $\delta \in \mathrm{Irr}(X \bmod Y)$, some $f \in G \setminus H$ and some integer r, then $r \neq 1$.

Assume that $\alpha\beta = (\alpha\beta)^f\delta$, for some $f \in G$ and $\delta \in \mathrm{Irr}(X \bmod Y)$. Since $\alpha_Y = \rho$ and $\beta_Y = \sigma$, we have that

$$\rho\sigma = (\alpha\beta)_Y = ((\alpha\beta)^f\delta)_Y = (\rho\sigma)^f.$$

Since $G_{\rho\sigma} = H$ by Claim 3.11 (ii), we have that $f \in H$. Therefore $\delta = 1$.

If in Claim 3.34 we have that $0 \in \{i, j, k\}$, then $\delta = 1$. Assume that $i = 0$. Since $0 < j < p$, we have that $g^j \in G \setminus H$. Set $f = g^j$. Then for some $k', s', t' \in \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, p-1\}$ we have that $f^{k'}H = g^kH$, $f^{s'}H = g^sH$, and $f^{t'}H = g^tH$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha\beta^{f} &= (\alpha\beta)^{f^{s'}} \\ \alpha\beta^{f^{k'}} &= (\alpha\beta)^{f^{t'}}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that if $i = 0$ in Claim 3.34, then Claim 3.35 (i) holds.

If $0 \notin \{i, j, k\}$, set $f = g^i$. An argument similar to that given for (i) shows that Claim 3.35 (ii) holds. ☐

Let g be as in Claim 3.35. Since X/Y is cyclic of order p, we may choose $x \in X$ such that $X = Y < x >$. By 3.25 we have $[X, H] = 1$. Suppose that $[x, g^{-1}] \in Z$. Then x centralizes both g^{-1} and H modulo Z. Hence $xZ \in \mathbf{Z}(G/Z)$, which is false by Claim 3.26. Hence $[x, g^{-1}] \in Y \setminus Z$ and so

$$Y = Z < y > \text{ is generated over } Z \text{ by } y = [x, g^{-1}]. \tag{3.36}$$

Since $[Y, G] \leq Z$ we have that $z = [y, g^{-1}] \in Z$. If $z = 1$, then $G = H < g >$ centralizes $Y = Z < y >$, since H centralizes $Y < X$ by 3.25, and G centralizes Z. This is impossible because $Z = \mathbf{Z}(G) < Y$. Thus

$$z = [y, g^{-1}] \text{ is a non-trivial element of } Z. \tag{3.37}$$

By (3.36) we have $y = [x, g^{-1}] = x^{-1}x^{g^{-1}}$. By (3.37) we have $z = [y, g^{-1}] = y^{-1}y^{g^{-1}}$. Finally $z^{g^{-1}} = z$ since $z \in Z$. Since $X = Z < x, y >$ is abelian by 3.25, it follows that

$$z^{g^{-j}} = z,\ y^{g^{-j}} = yz^j \text{ and } x^{g^{-j}} = xy^jz^{\binom{j}{2}}, \tag{3.38}$$

for any integer $j = 0, 1, \ldots, p-1$. Because $g^{-p} \in H$ centralizes X by 3.25, we have

$$z^p = 1 \text{ and } y^pz^{\binom{p}{2}} = 1.$$

But $p \geq 3$ is odd by Claim 3.9. Hence p divides $\binom{p}{2} = \frac{p(p-1)}{2}$ and $z^{\binom{p}{2}} = 1$. Therefore

$$y^p = z^p = 1. \tag{3.39}$$

It follows that y^i, z^i and $z^{\binom{i}{2}}$ depend only on the residue of i modulo p, for any integer $i \geq 0$.

Claim 3.40. *Suppose that*

$$\alpha\beta^g = (\alpha\beta)^{g^r}\delta, \tag{3.41}$$

and

$$\alpha\beta^{g^j} = (\alpha\beta)^{g^s}\delta, \tag{3.42}$$

for some $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$*,* $j \neq 1$*, some* $\delta \in \operatorname{Irr}(X \bmod Y)$*, and some* $r, s \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$*. Then*

$$\delta(x) = \beta(z)^{h(r-1)}, \tag{3.43}$$

where $2h \equiv 1 \bmod p$*.*

Proof. Evaluating both sides of the equation (3.41) at y, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(y)\beta(y)\beta(z) &= \alpha(y)\beta(yz) = \alpha(y)\beta(y^{g^{-1}}) && \text{by (3.38)}\\
&= (\alpha\beta^g)(y) = \alpha^{g^r}(y)\beta^{g^r}(y)\delta(y)\\
&= \alpha^{g^r}(y)\beta^{g^r}(y) && \text{since } \delta \in \operatorname{Irr}(X \bmod Y)\\
&= \alpha(y^{g^{-r}})\beta(y^{g^{-r}})\\
&= \alpha(yz^r)\beta(yz^r)\\
&= \alpha(y)\beta(y)\alpha(z)^r\beta(z)^r.
\end{aligned}$$

Cancelling $\alpha(y)\beta(y) \neq 0$, we get

$$\beta(z) = \alpha(z)^r\beta(z)^r. \tag{3.44}$$

We may also evaluate both sides of (3.41) at x, obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(x)\beta(x)\beta(y) &= \alpha(x)\beta(xy) = \alpha(x)\beta(x^{g^{-1}}) && \text{by (3.38)}\\
&= (\alpha\beta^g)(x) = ((\alpha\beta)^{g^r}\delta)(x)\\
&= \alpha^{g^r}(x)\beta^{g^r}(x)\delta(x) = \alpha(x^{g^{-r}})\beta(x^{g^{-r}})\delta(x)\\
&= \alpha(xy^r z^{\binom{r}{2}})\beta(xy^r z^{\binom{r}{2}})\delta(x)\\
&= \delta(x)\alpha(x)\beta(x)\alpha(y)^r\alpha(z)^{\binom{r}{2}}\beta(y)^r\beta(z)^{\binom{r}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Cancelling $\alpha(x)\beta(x) \neq 0$ we get

$$\beta(y) = \delta(x)\alpha(y)^r\beta(y)^r\alpha(z)^{\binom{r}{2}}\beta(z)^{\binom{r}{2}}. \tag{3.45}$$

Applying (3.42) at y we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha(y)\beta(y)\beta(z)^j &= \alpha(y)\beta(yz^j) = \alpha(y)\beta(y^{g^{-j}})\\
&= (\alpha\beta^{g^j})(y) = (\alpha\beta)^{g^s}(y)\delta(y)\\
&= \alpha^{g^s}\beta^{g^s}(y) && \text{since } \delta \in \operatorname{Irr}(X \bmod Y)\\
&= \alpha(y^{g^{-s}})\beta(y^{g^{-s}}) = \alpha(yz^s)\beta(yz^s)\\
&= \alpha(y)\beta(y)\alpha(z)^s\beta(z)^s.
\end{aligned}$$

Cancelling $\alpha(y)\beta(y) \neq 0$ we obtain

$$\beta(z)^j = \alpha(z)^s\beta(z)^s = (\alpha(z)\beta(z))^s$$

But (3.44) gives

$$\beta(z)^j = \alpha(z)^{jr}\beta(z)^{jr} = (\alpha(z)\beta(z))^{jr}.$$

The restriction $(\alpha\beta)_Z = \lambda\mu$ is faithful by Claim 3.9. The element $z \in Z$ is nontrivial by (3.37) and has order p by (3.39). So $\alpha(z)\beta(z) = (\lambda\mu)(z)$ is a primitive p-th root of unity. Hence the equation $(\alpha(z)\beta(z))^s = (\alpha(z)\beta(z))^{jr}$ implies that

$$s \equiv jr \bmod p. \tag{3.46}$$

We may also apply (3.42) at x to get

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(x)\beta(x)\beta(y)^j\beta(z)^{\binom{j}{2}} &= \alpha(x)\beta(xy^jz^{\binom{j}{2}}) = \alpha(x)\beta(x^{g^{-j}}) \\ &= (\alpha\beta^{g^j})(x) = \delta(x)\alpha^{g^s}(x)\beta^{g^s}(x) \\ &= \delta(x)\alpha(x^{g^{-s}})\beta(x^{g^{-s}}) = \delta(x)\alpha(xy^sz^{\binom{s}{2}})\beta(xy^sz^{\binom{s}{2}}) \\ &= \delta(x)\alpha(x)\beta(x)\alpha(y)^s\beta(y)^s\alpha(z)^{\binom{s}{2}}\beta(z)^{\binom{s}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Cancelling $\alpha(x)\beta(x) \neq 0$ we obtain

$$\beta(y)^j\beta(z)^{\binom{j}{2}} = \delta(x)\alpha(y)^s\beta(y)^s\alpha(z)^{\binom{s}{2}}\beta(z)^{\binom{s}{2}}. \tag{3.47}$$

But (3.45) gives

$$\beta(y)^j = \delta(x)^j\alpha(y)^{jr}\beta(y)^{jr}\alpha(z)^{j\binom{r}{2}}\beta(z)^{j\binom{r}{2}} = \delta(x)^j\alpha(y)^s\beta(y)^s\alpha(z)^{j\binom{r}{2}}\beta(z)^{j\binom{r}{2}},$$

where the last equality holds since $s \equiv jr \bmod p$.

Combining the previous equation with (3.47), we have

$$\delta(x)\alpha(y)^s\beta(y)^s\alpha(z)^{\binom{s}{2}}\beta(z)^{\binom{s}{2}}\beta(z)^{-\binom{j}{2}} = \delta(x)^j\alpha(y)^s\beta(y)^s\alpha(z)^{j\binom{r}{2}}\beta(z)^{j\binom{r}{2}}$$

Cancelling terms and simplifying, we get

$$\delta(x)^{j-1} = (\alpha(z)\beta(z))^{\binom{s}{2}-j\binom{r}{2}}\beta(z)^{-\binom{j}{2}}. \tag{3.48}$$

Since $p \geq 3$ is odd and $s \equiv jr \bmod p$, we have $\binom{s}{2} \equiv \binom{jr}{2} \bmod p$. This and (3.39) imply that $\alpha(z)^{\binom{s}{2}} = \alpha(z)^{\binom{jr}{2}}$ and $\beta(z)^{\binom{s}{2}} = \beta(z)^{\binom{jr}{2}}$. Hence

$$(\alpha(z)\beta(z))^{\binom{s}{2}-j\binom{r}{2}} = (\alpha(z)\beta(z))^{\binom{jr}{2}-j\binom{r}{2}}. \tag{3.49}$$

We can check that

$$\binom{jr}{2} - j\binom{r}{2} = r\frac{jr(j-1)}{2}. \tag{3.50}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha(z)\beta(z))^{\binom{jr}{2}-j\binom{r}{2}} &= (\alpha(z)\beta(z))^{r\frac{jr(j-1)}{2}} && \text{by (3.50)} \\ &= ((\alpha(z)\beta(z))^r)^{\frac{jr(j-1)}{2}} \\ &= \beta(z)^{\frac{jr(j-1)}{2}} && \text{by (3.44).} \end{aligned}$$

Combining the previous equality with (3.48) and (3.49) we get

$$\delta(x)^{j-1} = \beta(z)^{\frac{jr(j-1)}{2}-\binom{j}{2}} = \beta(z)^{\frac{j(j-1)(r-1)}{2}}. \tag{3.51}$$

Since $j \neq 1$, then $j-1 \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$. So we may divide by $j-1$. Therefore

$$\delta(x) = \beta(z)^{\frac{j(r-1)}{2}}. \tag{3.52}$$

Let $h \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$ such that $2h \equiv 1 \bmod p$. Then (3.52) implies (3.43). $\square$

Suppose that Claim 3.35 (ii) holds. Then by Claim 3.40 we have that $\delta(x) = \beta(z)^{hj(r-1)}$ and $\delta(x) = \beta(z)^{hk(r-1)}$. Thus $hj(r-1) \equiv hk(r-1) \bmod p$. Since $r \not\equiv 1 \bmod p$ and $2h \equiv 1 \bmod p$, we have that $k \equiv j \bmod p$, a contradiction. Thus Claim 3.35 (i) must hold.

We apply now Claim 3.40 with $\delta = 1$. Thus $1 = \delta(x) = \beta(z)^{hj(r-1)}$. Therefore $hj(r-1) \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Since $2h \equiv 1 \bmod p$, either $j \equiv 0 \bmod p$ or $r - 1 \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Neither is possible. That is our final contradiction. $\square$

4. Proof of Theorem A

Lemma 4.1. *Let G be a finite p-group and N be a normal subgroup of G. Assume that $\phi \in \mathrm{Irr}(N)$ is G-invariant. Then the set $\mathrm{Irr}(G \mid \phi)$ of all $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ lying over ϕ has either one or at least p members.*

Proof. Observe that if $|G : N| = 1$, the claim holds since $\mathrm{Irr}(G \mid \phi) = \phi$ has one member in that case. So we may assume that $|G : N| > 1$ and that the result holds for all strictly smaller values of $|G : N|$. Since G is a p-group, there is some normal subgroup M of G such that $N < M$ and $|M : N| = p$. Since ϕ is M-invariant and M/N is cyclic, the set $\mathrm{Irr}(M \mid \phi)$ consists of exactly p distinct extensions of ϕ to M. There are two cases to consider: either some $\psi \in \mathrm{Irr}(M \mid \phi)$ is not G-invariant, or every $\psi \in \mathrm{Irr}(M \mid \phi)$ is G-invariant.

Assume that some $\psi \in \mathrm{Irr}(M \mid \phi)$ is not G-invariant. Then the stabilizer H of ψ is a subgroup of index p in G, and $\mathrm{Irr}(M \mid \phi)$ consists of the $p = |G : H|$ distinct G-conjugates of ψ. In this case induction is a bijection of $\mathrm{Irr}(H \mid \psi)$ onto $\mathrm{Irr}(G \mid \phi) = \mathrm{Irr}(G \mid \psi)$. Since $|H : M| = |G : N|/p^2 < |G : N|$, we know by induction that $\mathrm{Irr}(H \mid \psi)$ has either one or at least p elements. So the result holds in this case.

We may assume now that every $\psi \in \mathrm{Irr}(M \mid \phi)$ is G-invariant. In this case $\mathrm{Irr}(G \mid \phi)$ is the disjoint union of p non-empty subsets $\mathrm{Irr}(G \mid \psi)$, for $\psi \in \mathrm{Irr}(M \mid \phi)$. Hence it has at last p members, and the result is proved. $\square$

Proof of Theorem A. Set $Z = \mathbf{Z}(G)$. Assume that $2\eta(\chi, \psi) \leq p$. By Lemma 3.1 we have that χ and ψ vanish outside the center Z of G. Thus $\chi(1)\psi(1) = |G : Z|$ by Corollary 2.30 of [4]. Let $\lambda \in \mathrm{Irr}(Z)$ and $\mu \in \mathrm{Irr}(Z)$ be the unique characters lying below χ and ψ respectively. Then $(\lambda\mu)$ lies below $\chi\psi$ and

$$(\chi\psi)(g) = \begin{cases} 0 \text{ if } g \in G \setminus Z \\ |G : Z|(\lambda\mu)(g) \text{ if } g \in Z. \end{cases}$$

Thus $\chi\psi = (\lambda\mu)^G$. Since $2\eta(\chi, \psi) \leq p$, by Lemma 4.1 applied to the normal subgroup Z and the G-invariant character $\lambda\mu \in \mathrm{Irr}(Z)$, we have that $\eta(\chi, \psi) = 1$. $\square$

5. Proof of Theorem B

Lemma 5.1. *Let P be a finite p-group, where p is a prime number. Let $\theta \in \mathrm{Irr}(P)$ be a character such that $\eta(\theta, \overline{\theta}) = m > 1$. Then $p < 2m + 1$ and*

$$\theta(1) \in \{p^i \mid i = 1, \ldots, m-2\} \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. Since G is supersolvable, by Theorem B of [1] we have that $\theta(1)$ is the product of at most $\eta(\theta) - 1$ prime numbers, where $\eta(\theta)$ is the number of distinct non-principal irreducible constituents of the product $\theta\overline{\theta}$. In our case $\eta(\theta) = m - 1$. So $\theta(1)$ is the product of at most $m - 2$ prime numbers, each of which must be p. Hence (5.2) holds.

Observe that $\mathrm{Ker}(\theta) = \mathrm{Ker}(\overline{\theta})$. Thus $\mathrm{Ker}(\theta\overline{\theta}) \geq \mathrm{Ker}(\theta) \cap \mathrm{Ker}(\overline{\theta}) = \mathrm{Ker}(\theta)$. The group $P/\mathrm{Ker}(\theta)$ has a faithful character χ such that the character $\theta \in \mathrm{Irr}(P)$ is inflated from χ. Also $\eta(\chi, \overline{\chi}) = m$. If p is an odd prime, by Theorem A we have that $\frac{p-1}{2} < m$. Thus $p < 2m + 1$. □

Proof of Theorem B. Let

$$S_n = \{ \prod (p_i)^{t_i} \mid p_i < 2n + 1, \, p_i \text{ is a prime number for all } i, \text{ and } 0 \leq t_i < n - 2\}$$

Let $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_r$ be the set of distinct prime divisors of $|G|$. For $i = 1, \ldots, r$, let P_i be a Sylow p-subgroup of G. Since G is nilpotent, we have that $G = \prod_{i=1}^{r} P_i$. Thus the restriction χ_{P_i} of χ to P_i is a multiple of an irreducible character θ_i. Let $m_i = \eta(\theta_i, \overline{\theta_i})$. Observe that

$$m_i \leq n \tag{5.3}$$

since $\chi\overline{\chi} = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \theta_i \overline{\theta_i}$ and $\eta(\chi, \overline{\chi}) = n$. Also

$$\chi(1) = \prod_{i=1}^{r} \theta_i(1). \tag{5.4}$$

If $m_i = 1$ then the character θ_i is linear. Assume that $m_i > 1$. By Lemma 5.1 we have that $\theta_i(1) = p^{t_i}$, where $t_i \leq m_i - 2$, and $p_i < 2m_i + 1$. By (5.3) we have $p_i < 2n + 1$. So by (5.4) we have

$$\chi(1) \in S_n.$$

□

6. Examples

Proposition 6.1. *Let p be an odd prime and m be any positive integer. There exist a p-group G and a faithful character $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ such that $\chi\chi$ has $\frac{p+1}{2}$ distinct irreducible constituents, χ does not vanish on $G \setminus \mathbf{Z}(G)$ and $\chi(1) = p^m$.*

Proof. Let $C = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots, p - 1\}$ be the additive group of integers modulo p. Let E be an extraspecial of exponent p and order p^{2m-1} if $m > 1$. Otherwise let E be a cyclic group of order p.

Set

$$A = E^C = \text{ the set of all functions from } C \text{ to } E.$$

Observe that A is just the direct product of p copies of E. and has order $p^{p(2m-1)}$. Also observe that C acts on C with the regular action, and thus it acts on the group A with action

$$(f^c)(x) = f(c + x)$$

for any $c, x \in C$.

Let G be the semi-direct product of C and A. Observe that $|G| = p^{p(2m-1)+1}$ and $\mathbf{Z}(G)$ is cyclic of order p. Thus $|G : \mathbf{Z}(G)| = p^{p(2m-1)}$. Since p is odd, $p^{p(2m-1)}$ is not a square. So no $\chi \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$ can vanish on $G \setminus \mathbf{Z}(G)$ (see Corollary 2.30 of [4]).

Let $\lambda \in \mathrm{Irr}(E)^{\#}$ have degree p^{m-1}. If $m > 1$, such character exists since E is an extra-special group of order p^{2m-1}. Observe that $\lambda\lambda = \lambda(1)\mu$ for some $\mu \in \mathrm{Irr}(E)$. For each $i = 0, 1, \dots p-1$, let $\mu_i \in \mathrm{Irr}(A)$ be a character such that for all $a \in A$ we have

$$\mu_i(a) = \mu(a(i)).$$

For $i = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$, choose $\lambda_i \in \mathrm{Irr}(A)$ so that we have, for all $a \in A$,

$$\lambda_i(a) = \lambda(a(i)).$$

Observe that the stabilizer of λ_i is A. Thus $\lambda_i^G \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$. Set $\chi = \lambda_0^G \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$.

Claim 6.2. *Let* $S = \{1, 2, \dots, \frac{p-1}{2}\}$. *Then*

(i) The set $\{\lambda_0\lambda_i \mid i \in S\} \cup \{\mu_0\}$ *is a subset of the irreducible constituents of* $(\chi\chi)_A$.

(ii) If $i, j \in S$ *and* $i \neq j$, *then* $\lambda_0\lambda_i$ *and* $\lambda_0\lambda_j$ *are not* G*-conjugate.*

(iii) Given $k, l = 0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1$, *where* $k \neq l$, *there exist* $j \in S$ *such that* $\lambda_k\lambda_l$ *and* $\lambda_0\lambda_j$ *are* G*-conjugate. Also for any* $k \in S$, $\lambda_k\lambda_k$ *is* G*-conjugate to* $\lambda_0\lambda_0$.

Proof. We can check that

$$\chi_A = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \lambda_i. \tag{6.3}$$

Thus

$$(\chi\chi)_A = \chi_A\chi_A = \sum_{i,j=0}^{p-1} \lambda_i\lambda_j.$$

By definition of A, we have that $\lambda_0\lambda_i \in \mathrm{Irr}(A)$ for any $i = 1, \dots, p-1$. Therefore $\lambda_0\lambda_i$ is an irreducible constituent of $(\chi\chi)_A$ for any $i \in S$. Also μ_0 is an irreducible constituent of $\chi\chi$ since $\lambda_0\lambda_0 = \lambda_0(1)\mu_0$.

Assume that $\lambda_0\lambda_i$ and $\lambda_0\lambda_j$, where $i, j \in S$ and $i \neq j$, are G-conjugates. Then there exists $c \in C$ such that $c+0 \equiv j \bmod p$ and $c+i \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Thus $i+j \equiv 0 \bmod p$. Therefore either $i > \frac{p-1}{2}$ or $j > \frac{p-1}{2}$. We conclude that either $i \notin S$ or $j \notin S$.

Fix $k, l = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$, where $k \neq l$. Let $c \equiv -k \bmod p$ and $r \equiv l - k \bmod p$, where $c, r \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$. Observe that $r \not\equiv 0 \bmod p$ since $k \neq l$. Then $(\lambda_k\lambda_l)^c = \lambda_0\lambda_r$. If $r \in S$, we have finished. Otherwise $r > \frac{p-1}{2}$. Let $t \equiv -r \bmod p$, where $t \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$. Observe that $t \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$ and $(\lambda_0\lambda_r)^t = \lambda_0\lambda_t$.

Clearly $(\lambda_0\lambda_0)^c = \lambda_c\lambda_c$ for any $c \in C$, and thus the last statement of the claim follows. □

Observe that the stabilizer of $\lambda_0\lambda_i$, where $i \in S$, is A. Thus $(\lambda_0\lambda_i)^G \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$. By Claim 6.2, we have that $(\lambda_0\lambda_i)^G \neq (\lambda_0\lambda_j)^G$ if $i \neq j$ and $i, j \in S$. Also

$$[(\lambda_0\lambda_i)^G, \chi\chi] = [(\lambda_0\lambda_i), (\chi\chi)_A] \neq 0,$$

where the last inequality follows from (6.3). Similarly, we can check that $(\mu_0)^G \in \mathrm{Irr}(G)$. It follows from Claim 6.2 that $\{(\lambda_0\lambda_i)^G \mid i \in S\} \cup \{(\mu_0)^G\}$ is the set of all distinct irreducible constituents of $\chi\chi$. This set has $|S| + 1 = \frac{p-1}{2} + 1 = \frac{p+1}{2}$ elements. □

Acknowledgment. Professor Everett C. Dade made a substantial contribution to this work. I thank him for that.

References

1. E. Adan-Bante, Products of characters and derived length, to appear in J. Algebra.
2. E. Adan-Bante, Products of characters with few irreducible constituents, preprint.
3. E. Adan-Bante, M. Loukaki, A. Moreto, Homogeneous products of characters, preprint.
4. I.M.Isaacs, Character Theory of Finite Groups. New York-San Francisco–London: Academic Press 1976

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, 61801

E-mail address: `adanbant@math.uiuc.edu`